



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,088	08/20/2003	Fujio Akahane	Q77070	4967
23373	7590	12/30/2004	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			CRANE, DANIEL C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3725	

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/644,088

Applicant(s)

AKAHANE ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel C Crane

Art Unit

3725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 12-18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3725

BASIS FOR REJECTIONS

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS ON FORMAL MATTERS

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "where is" is unclear in claim 1 at line 10.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS OVER PRIOR ART

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeglinski (4,425,777) in view of either one of Stegman (3,338,084) or Huang (5,485,664). Jeglinski discloses the basic method of manufacturing a liquid ejection head having chambers (funnel shaped region) and nozzles communicating with the chambers where the manufacturing includes a forging die 2. See column 3, last full paragraph, in Jeglinski where the plate is formed with a plurality of chambers and corresponding nozzles. It is well recognized in the progressive die art to provide a combination reference holes and deformation absorbers so as to accommodate the shaping operation as the workpiece is sequentially fed through the dies. This is shown by either

Art Unit: 3725

one of Stegman or Huang. As to Stegman, the continuous sheet 10 is provided with reference parts 12 and deformation absorbers 11. Similarly, Stegman shows reference parts 42 and deformation absorbers 41, 82. It would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to have modified Jeglinski's process by continuously forming the liquid ejection head while using reference parts and deformation absorbers using the concepts taught by either one of Stegman or Huang so as to facilitate accurate shaping and centering of the product in the progressive dies. In accordance with long held decisions:

“We would note that it is well settled that the test of obviousness is not whether the features of one reference can be bodily incorporated into the structure of another and proper inquiry should not be limited to the specific structure shown by the references, but should be into the concepts fairly contained therein, and the overriding question to be determined is whether those concepts would suggest to one skilled in the art the modification called for by the claims.” *In re Beckum et al.*, 169 USPQ 47.

As to claim 3, such would be determined through routine manufacturing set ups. This also applies to the limitation of claim 11 where the skilled artisan would select various dimensions based upon desired structural needs in the product.

WITHDRAWAL OF NONELECTED CLAIMS

Claims 12-18 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on December 15, 2004.

Art Unit: 3725

PRIOR ART CITED BY EXAMINER

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

RESPONSE BY APPLICANT(S)


Applicant(s) response to be fully responsive and to provide for a clear record must specifically point out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references, both those references applied in the objections and rejections and those references cited in view of the state of the art in accordance with 37 CFR 1.111 (a), (b) and (c).

INQUIRIES

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner D. Crane whose telephone number is (571) 272-4516. The examiner's office hours are 6:30AM-5:00PM, Tuesday through Friday. The examiner's supervisor, Mr. Allen Ostrager, can be reached at (571) 272-4521.

Documents related to the instant application may be submitted directly to Group 3700 by facsimile transmission at all times. Applicant(s) is(are) reminded to clearly mark any transmission as "DRAFT" if it is not to be considered as an official response. The Group 3725 Facsimile Center number is (703) 872-9306.

DCCrane
December 23, 2004


Daniel C. Crane
Primary Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 3725